

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the constructive comments in the June 27, 2007 Office action and respectfully request reconsideration of the application. Claims 1, 15-21, 25, 26, and 34 have been amended by this Amendment. Claims 1-34 are presented in the application for further examination.

In preparation for an allowance, claims 15-21, 25, and 34 have been amended to recite a "computer storage" medium or media to conform to current U.S. Patent and Trademark Office practice.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0042821 to Muret et al. (Muret). Applicants disagree, but have amended the claims for clarity.

Muret discloses a system for storing log data from log files 510 by a log engine 200 to a database 300. A report engine 400 is separately available, and accesses the stored data in the database 300 to produce reports to the user 530. Applicants direct the Examiner to FIG. 1 of Muret, and respectfully emphasize the logical flow clearly disclosed in FIG. 1 by viewing the arrowheads in the figure:

1. Log files 510 are received by the log engine 200;
2. Then the log engine 200 stores the log files in the database 300
3. At some subsequent time (e.g., after receiving a request from the user), the report engine 400 accesses the database 300 to obtain data, generate a report with the data, and send the report to the user 530.

The logical flow in FIG. 1 of Muret clearly shows the log files 510, the log engine 200, the database 300, and then the report engine 400. The text in Muret corresponding to FIG. 1 also supports this logical flow.

In contrast, independent claims 1, 16, and 21 in the present application recite, in part:

- A. Receiving data
- B. Then evaluating an expression based on the data
- C. Then storing the data in accordance with the evaluated expression.

The sequence of claim elements in claims 1, 16, and 21 is clear from the claim language used in each of claims 1, 16, and 21.

Applicants submit that the Examiner has applied the elements of Muret **out of order** to the limitations in independent claims 1, 16, and 21. For example, on page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner cites receiving data (200), evaluating (400), then storing (300) in Muret to reject the elements of claim 1, in that order. But that is not the order of the operations as taught by Muret. Muret teaches 200, then 300, then 400, as is clear from FIG. 1. In fact, Muret teaches away from the Examiner's application of Muret because it would not make any sense in Muret to produce a report (400) from data (200) and then store that data (300). Any generated report should go to the user 530, as clearly shown in FIG. 1 and supported by the corresponding text of Muret.

Additionally, Muret is not concerned, at all, with optimizing the storage of the log files. In contrast, the present application is directed to configuring data before storage. Data is divided into different logical and more manageable portions. This is particularly helpful when tracking voluminous web usage, or clickstream, information. For example, accessing configuration information permits Applicants to define a specific user navigation path (e.g., as an expression). Evaluating the expression allows the data to be organized and stored according to a desired relationship between the navigation path and data, which significantly improves the usefulness of this data. Aspects of the invention as claimed enable data to be logged based on information that is configurable dynamically according to the evaluated expression. Advantageously, aspects of the invention significantly improve post-storage queries by only storing relevant data. The received data is pre-filtered per configuration information to minimize downstream processing and to enable data sampling prior to storage of the data. (Application, paragraph [0007]).

Applicants submit that the Examiner has misunderstood the operation of Muret and has misconstrued Muret to reject claims 1, 16, and 21. Applicants request that the rejection of independent claims 1, 16, and 21 be removed.

The claims depending from independent claims 1, 16, 21, and 26 further limit the claims from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are patentable for least the same reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are patentable.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-34 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. Bain/

Robert M. Bain, Reg. No. 36,736
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

JJB/cjl